

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the amendments in this paper, claims 1-4, 6-11, 14, 15, and 17-21 will be pending in the above-identified application. Claim 1 is herein amended. This amendment is supported, for example, by paragraphs [0002] and [0003] of the specification. No new matter is entered. It is respectfully submitted that this paper is fully responsive to the Office Action mailed on August 13, 2010.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-2, 6, 8-10, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0223466 to *Schrader et al.* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0179469 to *Attar et al.*

Applicants disagree with the Office Action's characterization of the cited references and previously presented claim language. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants herein amend claim 1 to further clarify the presently claimed invention. In view of this amendment and the following remarks, Applicants request favorable reconsideration of pending claims 1-2, 6, 8-10, and 21.

First, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features currently added to claim 1. Accordingly, even if one were to combine the references, the result would not be the presently claimed invention.

Second, Applicants disagree with the contention that that *Schrader* in Fig. 2 and paragraph [0028] discloses the following claimed limitation: "wherein said communication

control system controls communications in an industrial application.” *See* Page 4 of the Office Action. Instead, *Schrader* merely discloses, for example, that communication is controlled for communicating pictures and other media. Whereas, claim 1 recites that the control communication system is a system for plant operation control.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that even if one were to combine the cited references, the result would not be the presently claimed invention.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Also, claims 2, 6, 8-10, and 21 are not obvious in view of the cited references because each of these claims depend from claim 1

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *SA* as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0110435 to *Wu et al.*

Claims 7, 11, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *SA* as applied to claim 1 above in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,021,124 to *Haarsten* further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0062278 to *Hadzic et al.*

Claims 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *SA* as applied to claim 1 above in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,541,919 to *Yong et al.*

Claims 3-4, 7, 11, 14, 15, and 17-20 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, these claims are not obvious in view of the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

**Conclusion**

In view of the aforementioned amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

/DARRIN A. AUITO/

Darrin A. Auito  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 56,024  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/rse